

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Ser. No. 09/936,479RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERPATENT
PD990014

MAR 27 2006

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-9 are pending. The claims remain unchanged from the listing of claims included in applicants' response filed December 5, 2005.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyer (US Pat. No. 5410546).

Applicants submit that Boyer fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-3 and 5-8, and as such, these claims are not anticipated by Boyer.

Claim 1 recites:

... receiving data transmitted in bus packets having a variable length, each bus packet having a header and a payload data field, the payload data field being divided into data blocks having a defined length, a combination of a defined number *n* of data blocks forming a data source packet of fixed length, section-by-section transmission of the data source packet within the framework of data blocks being permitted ... (emphasis added)

Claim 5 recites similar features in apparatus form. In the exemplary embodiment, the data blocks having a defined length is shown, for example, on Figure 1, see data blocks 12-15. Furthermore, there are, for example, 8 data blocks per data source packet (page 6, lines 13-14). Applicants submit that nowhere does Boyer disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitations of the cited claims.

Boyer, as made clear by its title, is directed to a system for computing CRC codes for a **fixed length block containing variable length packets** of data received out of order. In this regard, Figure 1 and its corresponding description discloses a blocking/compression unit 105 that transmits variable length packets over bus 108 to a page buffer memory 102 and a page CRC generator 101. The variable length packets are stored in page buffer memory 102 in fixed length blocks referred to as page buffers. See col. 2, lines 41-50; col. 1, lines 45-47. The variable length packets may be short enough to span only a fraction of the space in a single page buffer or may be long enough to span multiple page buffers.

Examples of the variability of the packet length with regard to the page buffer size is shown on figures 5-7, in which figure 5 shows a packet length that corresponds to the page buffer size, figure 6 shows a packet length that spans

PATENT

PD990014

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Ser. No. 09/936,479

approximately 1.3 the page buffer size and figure 7 shows a packet length that spans approximately 2 times the page buffer size.

Although the page buffer is disclosed to be of fixed size blocks, nowhere does Boyer disclose or suggest that the **data in the data payload portion of the packet is divided into data blocks having a defined length**. These are entirely different features and one skilled in the art would understand that the recited data blocks having a defined length does not correspond to the page buffers taught by Boyer.

The portions of Boyer cited by the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitation of claim 1. Col. 6, lines 30-40 discusses the reordering of data stored in Page Buffer Memory 102 into the desired format. Col. 10, lines 9-64 discusses the operation of the Control Processor 103 in writing and re-ordering data packets as they are received and written into the Page Buffer Memory 102. Furthermore, nowhere in these cited portions does Boyer mention or suggest that the data in the data payload portion is divided into data blocks having a defined length, or that a combination of a defined number n of data blocks form a **data source packet of fixed length**.

Additionally, present claim 1 recites:

carrying out a **modulo-n counting of the data blocks** in order to determine the data source packet boundaries, and in that the beginning of a new data source packet is signaled to a memory management device at the beginning of the next counting interval (emphasis added)

Claim 5 recites similar features in apparatus form. Applicants submit that nowhere does Boyer disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitation of claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that the counter 415 in figure 4 corresponds to an element that carries out the recited counting of the data blocks. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Col. 13, lines 1-19, cited by the Office Action, Boyer mentions that counter 415 is used internally in the state control logic 411 to determine when the page buffers have been filled. For that purpose, the counter counts each byte as the data is received via bus 108. When a complete page buffer is filled, the counter is decremented to zero and signifies an end of page

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Ser. No. 09/936,479

condition that is used by state control logic 411 to control address generation at page buffer boundaries, see col. 13, lines 21-23.

By contrast, present claim 1 recites **modulo-n counting of data blocks**. A data block does not correspond to the data word of Boyer. The data blocks correspond to a block of data words and therefore simple byte counting as disclosed in Boyer does not anticipate the modulo-n counting of data blocks recited in claim 1.

For the reasons discussed above, applicants submit that Boyer is directed to an entirely different problem and provides an entirely different solution than those of the present invention, and that Boyer fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of present claims 1-3 and 5-8.

Rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer (US Pat. No. 5410546)

The Office Action alleges that the additional features recited in claim 4 relate to matters of design choice in implementing the system of Boyer. Applicants respectfully submit that even assuming arguendo that the recited feature of claim 4 relate to matters of design choice as applied to Boyer, that assertion fails to cure the defect of Boyer as applied to present claim 1, and thus, present claim 4, remains patentably distinguishable over Boyer.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer (US Pat. No. 5410546) in view of Lo et al. (US Pat. No. 6324178)

Lo is cited as teaching the use of a data bus designed according to IEEE 1394, and the Office Action alleges that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Boyer and Lo. However, applicants submit that even assuming arguendo that Boyer and Lo are combined in the manner suggested, the suggested combination still fails to cure the defect of Boyer as applied to present claim 5, and thus, present claim 9 remains patentably distinguishable over the combination of Boyer and Lo.

PATENT
PD990014

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Ser. No. 09/936,479

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request such action. No fee is believed due in regard to the present amendment. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832. Should any questions arise regarding any of the above, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6815.

Respectfully submitted,

Siegfried Schweidler et al.



Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
March 27, 2006

By:

Paul P. Kiel, Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,677
(609) 734-6815